

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY At No. 663 Craig Street, by J. GILLIES. G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE: To all country Subscribers Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 17, 1869.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR. DECEMBER—1869. Friday, 17—Ember Day. Of the Feria. Saturday, 18—Ember Day. Expectation of B. V. M. Sunday, 19—Fourth of Advent.

TO OUR DELINQUENT SUBSCRIBERS. We take this opportunity of informing all Subscribers in arrears to this Office, that, wearied out with reiterated and fruitless appeals to their sense of justice and common honesty, we have commenced banding over their accounts to a lawyer for collection; and shall for the future continue so to deal with all those who will not, except on compulsion, pay their just debts.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The opening of the Ecumenical Council at Rome on Wednesday the 8th inst., Feast of the Immaculate Conception, has been of course the great event, not only of the past week, but of the present century. Since the opening of the great Council of Trent under Paul III., on the 13th of December 1545, no such an event has occurred in Christendom: and for the number of Bishops in attendance in obedience to the summons of the Sovereign Pontiff, no General Council that has yet been held can compete with that now sitting under the august presidency of the present illustrious occupant of the Chair of Peter.

We are of course as yet without details as to this great ceremony, which henceforward will mark an epoch in the history of the world, and will be held in remembrance when the little men who now fame and strut on the earth's stage—the Kings, and Emperors, and Presidents—having played out their several parts, shall have passed away and become forgotten. All we know is through the meagre report of the telegram which inform us that on the ever memorable Eighth of December, 1869, Pope Pius IX., followed by 700 Fathers of the Catholic Church formally opened the Ecumenical Council of the Vatican, offering the Holy Sacrifice for the assistance of the Holy Ghost. Vast crowds were assembled to witness the august ceremony. On the 10th the Holy Father stood up amidst his brethren—see Acts xv. 7—and delivered to them an Allocution in which he expressed his satisfaction at the numerous attendance of the Bishops of the Church throughout the world in obedience to his summons. From the uttermost parts of the earth, had they gathered themselves together at the voice of the successor of St. Peter calling on them to come and take council with him on the affairs of the Church, now, as she ever has been, beset by enemies. The text of this important Allocution will no doubt be laid before the world: and whilst the Fathers of the Council deliberate, and aided by the Holy Ghost, determine upon what is required to meet and ward off the dangers which menace the ark of Christ and Christian civilisation, it is for us, the laity, helping them with our prayers, calmly and trustfully to await their decisions; in the full confidence that those decisions will be the infallible utterance of Him Who has pledged Himself to be with the Church all days, even to the end.

On the same day on which at Rome the Council of the Catholic Church was opened, a Protestant or anti-Catholic Congress was opened at Naples to consider by what means the work of God may be frustrated and brought to naught. The health of Victor Emmanuel is quite established; what passed between him and his spiritual advisers whilst as yet his life hung trembling in the balance, we know not. On the one hand, the anti-Catholic press boasts of the King's firmness; whilst it is no less certain that by many of the Catholic organs, notably the *Unita Cattolica*, warm satisfaction is expressed with the King's conduct, of which we are assured that the fruits will shortly be visible. For the sake of his soul—and kings have souls to be damned or saved as other men have, though politicians of the Cavour stamp cannot credit it—we trust that this may be true. As we think of

Victor Emmanuel, and what by a hearty repentance he might yet be, we are forcibly reminded of Buros' address to another illustrious anti-Catholic potentate:—

"Oh wad ye tak a thought an' men' 'Ye aibhios might—I dinna ken 'till hee a stak."

Next in importance—though *longo intervallo*—we may reckon the message of the President of the U. States to Congress. This document is remarkable in that it is shorter than the generality of Presidential messages, and in that it is for the most part intelligible. The points insisted upon which are most interesting to outsiders, are the Alabama claims, Cuba, and the Naturalisation laws. On the first point the President says ditto to Mr. Sumner; but we are not without hopes that the long standing political sore may yet be healed, and latest telegrams hint that Lord Clarendon is about to reopen negotiations with the U. States government for the settlement of the said Alabama claims.

The Irish news is still very discouraging. The Tipperary election—null in law since the elected is legally a convicted felon—resulted as the telegraph reported in the election of O'Donovan Rossa by a considerable majority over his opponent Mr. Heron. The High Sheriff declared the former elected, and is by some criticised for so doing, since O'Donovan Rossa was not eligible, and the votes given for him were thrown away. In all probability the decision will be that Mr. Heron is the duly elected member for Tipperary, and will take his seat in the House of Commons without opposition. Still it cannot be denied that the social and political conditions of Ireland are menacing, more so as the *Times* admits, than they have been for the last thirty years.

The Red River difficulty will it seems be got over quietly and amicably. The insurgents we are assured are by no means the majority of the population, and the loyal population is numerous, and prepared to assert the majesty of law. We trust that such may be the case.

A rebellion in Portugal is reported as imminent. Neither the names of the leaders nor their objects are indicated. The story that Queen Isabella on her retreat from Spain carried with her the Crown diamonds is authoritatively contradicted by the Queen's Intendant.

The Ecumenical Council has adjourned till after the Feast of the Epiphany, thus closely following the precedent of the Council of Trent, which meeting in first session on the 13th December, resolved that the second session should be held on the seventh of January, the first Thursday after the Epiphany. The French Government has, it is said, made known that it will accept any declaration of Papal infallibility as inopportune, and a violation of the Concordat. The Fathers of the Council will decide as inspired by the Holy Ghost; and whatever they may decree will be accepted as God's truth, to be holden of all men, no matter what kings, or emperors, or councillors of State, or *prefets*, *et hoc genus omne* may say to the contrary. The Protestant council is in session at Naples. For President it has Bicardi, and it has received with much enthusiasm letters from Victor Hugo, Garibaldi, and other eminent enemies of the Church. By latest telegram we learn that the Protestant Council "has turned out a dead failure." Fresh troops to the amount of 5000 have been sent to Ireland. The County of Tipperary and part of Londonderry, so it is said, are to be proclaimed, and a suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* Act is in contemplation. Matters are growing serious.

There were many sad hearts amongst the Catholics of this City, and those of them especially who are members of the St. Patrick's Congregation, when on Sunday morning last they heard the tolling of the bell which announced the death of their well loved friend and pastor, the Rev. Frederick Bakewell, of the Seminary of St. Sulpice. For some days his life had been despaired of, as it was known that he was suffering under a serious malady contracted in the performance of his sacred duties as a priest, and in his attendance at the bedside of the afflicted; yet hoping as it were against hope, we still trusted that God would spare him to us. But his heavenly Father, Who does all things well, saw fit to summon His servant to the enjoyment of that exceeding great reward which He has promised to those who love Him, and do His will on earth. What then shall we say? God's holy will be done; and so resigning ourselves to the loss, we will cherish his memory in our inmost hearts.

The deceased was a young man who was early converted to the Catholic faith, which he ever after ardently cherished. An accomplished gentleman, a ripe and elegant scholar as well as a fervent Christian, and a laborious, self-denying priest, he won the respect and love of all who had the happiness of knowing him; and in losing him, the Seminary of St. Sulpice has lost a member who was well fitted by his learning and virtues to confer lustre even on that illustrious Society, whose labors in the cause of science and Christianity, in Europe as well as in America, are matters of history.

The deceased Rev. Frederick Bakewell was only 32 years of age at the time of his death, having been born in England, at Norwich, in the year 1837. When about eleven years of age, he came with his family to the United States, where, having embraced the Catholic faith, he was called to the religious life. In 1857, he entered the Seminary of St. Sulpice, of which body he remained a member to the day of his death exercising his sacred ministry amongst the Irish, and English speaking portion of the population of Montreal, as one of the clergy attached to the St. Patrick's Church. During the late Jubilee his labors were great, his zeal indefatigable. It was thus that he contracted the disease, inflammation of the lungs, complicated with a typhoid fever, which, after five days of severe suffering, terminated his short, but glorious existence.

His mortal remains were committed to the earth on Wednesday last, after a solemn service in the Parish Church of Notre Dame.—R.I.P.

In the reign of Charles the First it used to be asked "what do the Arminians hold?" The reply was "they hold all the best livings in England." This cannot indeed be said of the Ritualists of the days of Queen Victoria, though from their Romanising tendencies they may be called the spiritual children of those who two centuries ago were styled Arminians. The present Ritualists are in a minority in the Church of England; their superiors on the Bench and in the Treasury look coldly on them; preferment is not in their way; and were mitres as plentiful as blackberries, were it to rain mitres, not one under the actual regime of Church and State, would be found to fit their heads. Rich livings are scarce amongst them, and it cannot in any sense be determined what they hold, either in a doctrinal or in a secular sense.

So far it may be perhaps incorrect to say that Ritualists hold all Catholic doctrine except that of the Pope's supremacy: for what is a Ritualist? Without a sharp exhaustive definition of the term, all controversy as to the truth or falsity of Dr. Rodgers' assertion at which the Rev. Mr. Woods has taken umbrage, must be an idle waste of words.

There are Ritualists, and Ritualists. Every minister even of the most intensely Protestant sect is more or less a Ritualist; every outward sensible act whereby he seeks to express respect for God is an act of Ritualism: and the difference betwixt the lowest form of Protestantism, and the highest form of Anglican worship is but a difference of degree, not of kind. What then is a Ritualist? Is not a white surplice Ritualism? Why should a gentleman when ministering at the pulpit or reading desks of the Protestant Church of England as By Law Established put on another dress than that which he wears when taking tea with his wife, or giving his children their bread and butter in due season? The surplice is Ritualism! The kneeling at one time, the standing up at another, all changes of place and posture are acts of Ritualism, and they who practise them are neither more nor less than Ritualists. It is not correct therefore to say that all Ritualists hold all Catholic doctrine except the Pope's supremacy: and this statement of Dr. Rodgers must be taken in a limited or restricted sense.

What we conceive that he meant is this:—That that section of the Ritualists who in the celebration of divine worship, and especially in the celebration of the Anglican Communion service, have adapted the outward forms, and ceremonies of the Catholic Church, such as lighted candles and other decorations on the communion table; who designate that table an Altar—a term unknown to the Book of Common Prayer—who style themselves Priests, and not ministers: who, to the consecrated bread and wine render external or sensible marks of homage or respect: who celebrate irrespective of the numbers of communicants from amongst the congregation: and who in fact profess or show forth in all their outward acts the doctrines of the Catholic Church with regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, do inwardly and in their hearts hold also the Catholic doctrine. This is not to insult the said section of the Anglican ministers, but rather to do homage to their honesty and their intelligence; for what more contemptible, morally and intellectually, than the adoption of rites and ceremonies divorced from the faith that vitalises them, and which they were designed to set forth. A Ritualist, clad in chasuble, with lights on the communion table, and incense burning before it, but without the Catholic faith in his heart, would indeed be a pitiable object, the most abject specimen of degraded humanity conceivable. Ritualism without the Catholic faith is but frippery, or man-millinery.

Dr. Rodgers thinks too highly of his friends and late brother ministers to attribute to them such manumery as this. He sees that they imitate closely the outward acts of the Catholic priest; he attributes to them therefore the same inward faith, and in this sense he says truly that except in the matter of the Papal Supremacy they hold all Catholic doctrine: and had he been more careful in his lecture to define the sense in

which he used the terms Ritualists, and Ritualism, no exception to the truth of his assertion could have been taken. As it was he erred in predicating of all Ritualists—of whom some may after all be mere man-milliners and posture-mongers—that which can truly be predicated only of the sincere, the earnest, and the devout.

It is in truth as impossible to say what Ritualists hold, as it is to say what Protestants hold, for the terms "Ritualist" and "Protestant" are vague; and for want of defining, Dr. Rodgers has been taxed by the Rev. Mr. Woods, with the sin of intentionally misrepresenting. The lecturer would no doubt excuse himself, were he here present, and had he read Mr. Wood's letter in the *Montreal Gazette*, by assuring the writer that he did not look upon him as a Ritualist, but as a very Low Churchman indeed. It was to men of a very different stamp, to men with stiff back bones, men who dread neither the frowns of Anglican officials, nor the loss of popularity amongst their congregations—to men who if they do put candles on their communion tables, do not put them there for a piece of mere dumb-show, and who are not afraid to light them; to men who if they do call themselves priests, are not ashamed of the essential function of the priest, and who therefore call their communion tables "Altars," and the acts which at that table they perform, "Sacrifice"—who above all believe and openly teach that the bread which they consecrate is verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ: it is to men of this stamp, of this high temper that Dr. Rodgers alluded, when he said that the Ritualists held all Roman Catholic doctrine with the exception of the Papal Supremacy: and the Rev. Mr. Woods may make his mind quite easy upon the subject. Dr. Rodgers did not allude to him; when he spoke of the Ritualists.

SHUFFLING.—In our last we called upon the editor of the *Witness* to cite the language justly obnoxious to the epithet "truculent," by us employed when treating of the Irish Land Question; and to quote the very words of any passage wherein the *TRUE WITNESS* insisted, or even insinuated, that the titles to their property of the present Irish landlords were null—pledging ourselves, should the *Witness* produce any one such passage, to retract it, and apologise for it, as revolutionary, and unworthy of a Catholic journal. For all reply to this challenge the *Witness* favors us with the annexed paragraph:

The *True Witness* says that he abhors such revolutionary views as we recently ascribed to him concerning the Irish land question, and intimates that they could only be found, if found at all, in his columns in the language of others, and that the context should be given. This would be no more than fair had there been any context; but, so far as we recollect, the views in question, namely, that the land of Ireland was for the people of Ireland, &c., appeared without any disclaimer or refutation. This is a point which can be easily settled by a reference to our neighbor's files.

Then, if "a point which can be so easily settled," why does not the *Witness* settle it, by citing the passage on which he bases his attack on the *TRUE WITNESS*? Were it in his power to do so, he, we may be sure, would not hesitate, but would only be too glad to convict us of that which he lays to our charge. Again, therefore, we reiterate the challenge thrown out to him in our last; and call upon him publicly, either to make good his attack upon us, by quoting our very words, — a thing which he himself tells us "can be easily" done; or else to retract his accusations. But we forget ourselves: we are calling upon the editor of the *Witness* to act the part of a man of honor, of a gentleman, and of a Christian; as if these words had any existence in his vocabulary, as if one like him could understand them. A blind man is a better judge of colors, or a deaf man of harmony, than such a one as the editor of the *Witness* can be of the duty of an honest man towards him whom he has calumniated.

In its issue of the 13th inst., the *Evening Telegraph*, makes the following assertion:—

"Pope Honorius was stigmatised as a 'heretic' by Pope Gregory the Great.—Query—Was the former 'infallible'?"

May we request our respected contemporary to furnish us with the proof of this statement that Gregory the Great stigmatised Pope Honorius as a "heretic." There are one or two reasons which incline us to doubt the accuracy of the *Telegraph's* knowledge of ecclesiastical history. They are these:—

(1.) Gregory the Great died on the 12th March, A.D. 604.

(2.) Honorius 1st only ascended the Pontifical throne 27th October 625, or 21 years after the death of the Pope who is said to have stigmatised him as a "heretic."

There is a little obscurity here which perhaps the *Evening Telegraph* will have the kindness to elucidate. As the *Montreal Gazette* reproduces the statement of the *Evening Telegraph*, we trust to the well known courtesy of the first named for his assistance in throwing "more light," as Tribulation Cumming would say, on this dark spot in ecclesiastical history.

Querebo, Dec. 13.—The House opened at a quarter past three o'clock.

FAS EST AB HOSTE DOCERI.—The following on education, that is secular education, is from the *Baltimore Methodist*, as quoted by the *Montreal Witness*:—

"This notion that education is the antidote to vice is a sad mistake. A community can be educated in vice. Unless the heart be educated in piety, the education, or advantage of knowledge given to appetite, at once stimulates it by enlarging the sources of enjoyment, and gratifies it by ministering to its powers."

Now if this be true, the one argument for State Schoolism falls to the ground: for that argument is based on the assumption that "ignorance is the mother of crime," and that vice is an intellectual defect; which, since crime and vice are costly to the State, the latter is bound to repress or eradicate by means of education. But though the State official may use this argument, though for the sake of persecuting Catholics, thousands may have recourse to it—amongst themselves almost all Protestants repudiate it as a sad mistake, and insist upon the necessity of a religious education; of an education of the heart rather than of the head; in piety rather than in reading, writing, and arithmetic, as the sole reliable antidote against vice, and crime. In their own hearts Protestants, even the most clamorous for State Schoolism know well, that the sort of education which alone the State school can supply can have no effect upon vice or crime except that of changing its direction, and of multiplying its resources, thereby making it more than ever dangerous to society. The uneducated criminal will be a pickpocket, or a burglar: endowed with secular education, and instructed in the arts of reading, writing, and reckoning, he will rise to the proportions of a forger, and attain eminence as a fraudulent bankrupt, robbing his thousands; whilst the injuries inflicted on society by the uneducated villain affect only a few individuals. State or secular education only makes its subjects more dangerous, by increasing their means of offence, by putting deadly weapons in their hands.

If however we are to have "hearts educated in piety" as the *Baltimore Methodist* contends should be the case, we must have a distinctively religious education: but such an education is impossible in mixed schools, or schools frequented by Catholic and Protestant children. The denominational or separate system is the only one under which positive religious education can be imparted, unless the public schools are to be used openly and avowedly as instruments of proselytism.

Made. Guibord, widow of the man whose remains were refused admittance to the consecrated portion of the Cote des Neiges cemetery, instigated, we suppose, by unknown parties who cautiously keep out of sight, made an affidavit which was published in the *Montreal Herald*, to the effect that a man named Monette waited on her with a message from the Rev. Mr. Rousselot, priest of the parish of Notre Dame; that in consequence she accompanied the said Monette to the Seminary, where she had an interview with the Rev. M. Rousselot, who threatened her, in case she persisted in her action against the Seminary and Fabrique, with the withdrawal of the sum of money which she receives from the *Benevolent Society of Notre Dame de Bonsecours*; and promised her, if she would retire her action, that everything should be settled to her satisfaction, and that she herself should be taken good care of. We suppose that there can be no doubt that the unhappy woman did make oath—(at the instigation, we also suppose, of some unprincipled knaves who keep in the background)—to the above story, which is false in every particular.

In reply, the Rev. M. Rousselot, M. Monette, and M. Octave Lagace, who were both present at the interview which took place at the Seminary betwixt the first named, and the woman Guibord, give the following testimony on affidavit before J. O. Labadie, C. C. S., and which was published in the *Herald* of the 9th instant:—

The Rev. M. Rousselot having sworn that the statements put forth by the woman Guibord in her affidavit "are completely false and groundless," proceeds to give the true version of the story in the following words:—

1. It is false that I told Madame Guibord that I had sent for her to tell her that she must discontinue the action she had brought to have her husband interred.

2. It is false that I told Madame Guibord that if she did not discontinue that action, the Benevolent Society of Notre Dame de Bonsecours, to which her husband belonged, would not pay her the allowance granted to widows.

3. It is false that I told the said Madame Guibord that if she would discontinue her action she would want for nothing, and that all which concerned the interment of her husband would be arranged; that his body would be put in the vault, and that all the rest would follow and go right.

And I add, that what follows is the only true and exact account of my interview with the said Dame Guibord on Friday, the 3rd December current. Mr. Narcisse Monette, who had been entrusted by Madame Guibord with laying out her husband, and with the management of her affairs, came to the Seminary to tell me that he had just seen Madame Guibord, and that she had been much astonished to learn that an action had been raised, and that she did not wish to go on. I then said, "Well! if what you tell me is true, tell that lady to come to me and let me know this from herself."

In consequence, at four o'clock in the afternoon, Made. Guibord came to the parlour of the Seminary and there, in presence of Mr. Monette, who heard the whole conversation, and of Mr. Lagace who heard part of it, I asked her if it was true that she did a